

REMARKS

By the present amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 4, 5 and 7, cancelled Claims 8-9, and added Claims 11-12. Claims 1-7 and 10-12 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 7, and 11 are independent claims.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the personal interview held November 18, 2005. The present response summarizes the agreement reached. At the interview a proposed amendment to the claims was presented for discussion. Proposed new Claim 11 set forth a boxing glove having an inflatable bladder with two conduits, each conduit having a unidirectional valve associated therewith. One unidirectional valve is an intake valve; the other is a pressure release valve. Arguments were advanced that none of the applied prior references taught an intake valve and a pressure release valve, such that the bladder is maintained in inflated state when uncompressed. The Examiner indicated that the proposed new Claim 11 having these specific limitations would be allowable over the prior art, subsequent to a further search.

In the Office Action dated September 16, 2005 the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Sutherland.

Applicant has amended the instant claims to recite that each unidirectional valve is coupled to the conduits of the fluid absorbent material inside the boxing glove. Applicant will advance arguments hereinbelow to illustrate the manner in which the presently claimed

invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited and applied prior art. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The applied prior art reference to Sutherland discloses a pneumatic boxing glove having a pair of inflatable chambers located in the impact area of the glove. Each chamber has a conduit extending to the wrist end of the glove. Each conduit is used to selectively inflate and deflate the chamber associated therewith. The two chambers are separate, independent of each other, thus there is no fluid transmission between the two chambers. Sutherland is not an anticipatory reference against the claims because the originally presented claims recited first and second conduits in communication with a single fluid absorbent material. Applicant has amended the claims to set forth that the conduits have unidirectional valves coupled thereto. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this particular ground of rejection.

The Examiner rejected Claims 5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutherland in view of Picchietti et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. .

The applied primary prior art reference to Sutherland, as discussed above, does not teach the recited claim limitations. The applied prior art reference to Picchietti et al. discloses a selectively pneumatic bowling glove having an inflatable bladder with a first inflating conduit, and a second deflating conduit. The first inflating conduit has a pumping mechanism and a intake valve such that the bladder may be inflated via the pumping mechanism. The deflating conduit includes a release valve, for selectively deflating the

bladder. The Examiner alleges that the release valve of Picchietti et al. is a pressure release valve. The allegation is erroneous because the function of the bladder in Picchietti et al. to provide a more rigid wrist support while bowling. If the release valve were to be a pressure release valve, the action of bowling would cause the release valve to open, deflating the bladder, thereby losing the wrist support of the glove. Further, the bowling glove of Picchietti et al. does not maintain an inflated state because the intake conduit is connected to a pump, which must be actuated in order to inflate the bladder.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is not disclosure in either Sutherland or Picchietti et al. that would have led one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at Applicant's unique construction of elements. Applicant respectfully submits that the alleged combination of Sutherland and Picchietti et al. does not meet the instant claim limitations. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this particular ground of rejection.

Application Serial No.: 10/660,663
Art Unit: 3765

Attorney Docket No. 23394.00
Confirmation No. 7559

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If such is not the case, the Examiner is requested to kindly contact the undersigned in an effort to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Warren S. Edmonds
Registration No. 39,642
(703) 486-1000

RCL:DHT:wse